

## HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL held in the Civic Suite, Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon, PE29 3TN on Monday, 15 October 2012.

PRESENT: Councillor D B Dew – Chairman.

Councillors Mrs M Banerjee,  
Mrs B E Boddington, P L E Bucknell, G J Bull,  
E R Butler, N J Guyatt, R B Howe,  
Mrs P J Longford, A J Mackender-Lawrence,  
R G Tuplin, P K Ursell and R J West.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors W T Clough, S M Van De Kerkhove and P D Reeve.

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor D M Tysoe .

### **33. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 17th September 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **34. MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

Councillor P L E Bucknell declared a non-pecuniary interest in Minute No. 35 (c) having regard to his close association with a resposdee to consultation on the application and chose to leave the Civic Suite during discussion and voting thereon.

Councillor G J Bull declared a non-pecuniary interest in Minute No. 35 (f) and (i) and chose to leave the Civic Suite during discussion and voting thereon.

Councillor R B Howe declared a non-pecuniary interest in Minute No. 35 (c), chose to remain in the meeting but did not vote on the application.

Councillor R J West declared a non-pecuniary interest in Minute No. 35 (a) by virtue of his association with the applicant and chose to leave the Civic Suite during discussion and voting thereon.

### **35. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**

The Planning Service Manager (Development Management) submitted reports (copies of which are appended in the Minute Book) on applications for development to be determined by the Panel and advised Members of further representations (details of which also are appended in the Minute Book) which had been received in connection therewith since the reports had been prepared. Whereupon, it was

RESOLVED

- (a) **Change of use from store to tea room, building adjacent 8 Church Road, Grafham – 12/01368/FUL and 12/1369/ADV**

*(See Minute No. 34 for Members' interests.)*

*(Ms V Hunt, objector, addressed the Panel on the applications.)*

that the applications be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted and additionally to provide –

- ◆ for the installation of obscure fixed glass in the window on the side elevation to prevent overlooking of number 2 Breach Road, Grafham and for the inclusion of a note on the Decision Notice to draw to the applicant's attention the legal obligations in respect of this condition; and
- ◆ for the hours of operation to be reduced to require the tea rooms to be closed to the public on Bank or Public Holidays in addition to Sundays.

- (b) **Erection of agricultural building for free range hens with new vehicular access, hardstanding and feed bins, land south of Manor Farm, Winwick Road, Hamerton and Steeple Gidding – 12/01228/FUL**

*(Councillor D Tysoe, Ward Councillor, Mr N Saunders, objector and Mr I Pick, agent addressed the Panel on the application.)*

- (i) that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted; and
- (ii) that the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy be authorised to formulate an additional condition requiring the applicant to make arrangements, to the satisfaction of the local planning authority, for the storage and disposal of manure.

- (c) **Installation of two wind turbines each 36.4 metres high (to mid point of hub) and 46 metres high to blade tip (maximum total height) with three 9.6 metre length blades plus ancillary development to replace two GAIA turbines (permitted under 10/00736/FUL) amended description, Hamerton Zoo Park, Hamerton Road, Steeple Gidding, Huntingdon – 12/00670/FUL**

*(See Minute No. 34 for Members' interests.)*

*(Councillor D Tysoe, Ward Councillor, Councillor Mrs F Anderson, Hamerton and Steeple Gidding Parish Meeting and Mr A Swales, applicant addressed the Panel on the application.)*

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy to include those listed in paragraph 6 of the report now submitted.

At 8.20pm, the Panel adjourned and Councillor N Guyatt left the meeting at this point.

Upon resumption at 8.25pm

- (d) **Erection of end terraced house with on-site car parking, 20 Caldecote Road, Eynesbury – 12/01178/FUL**

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted.

- (e) **Retrospective Planning to install new sawdust silo and retain old silo on-site, Sundown Straw Products, Station Road, Tilbrook – 12/01109/FUL**

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy to include one non-standard condition relating to the retention of installed noise attenuation measures and informatives relating to permitted development tolerances and the maintenance of noise attenuation measures.

- (f) **Change of use of former public house to dwelling, including first floor extension and conversion of barn to granny annexe and retention of garage, Royal Oak, 106 Main Street, Yaxley 12/00452/FUL and 12/00453/LBC**

*(See Minute No. 34 for Members' interests.)*

*(Mr C Wheeler, objector and Mr D Rayner, applicant addressed the Panel on the application.)*

- (i) that application No. 12/00452/FUL be refused for the following reasons -
- ◆ the proposed 1st floor extension constitutes an overly large edition to the listed building with an assertive dormer window and unsympathetic building materials (concrete roof tiles and plastic rain water goods) that

would dramatically change its scale, form and appearance to the extent that the special historic and architectural interest of the building as a designated heritage asset would be substantially harmed. As such the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, policy ENV6 of the East of England Plan 2008, policy En2 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy E3 of the Huntingdonshire Development Management DPD: Proposed Submission 2010 and Policy DM27 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 – Development Management Policies, 2012; and

- ◆ the unauthorised garage proposed to be retained within the curtilage of the listed building is incongruously modern in relation to its historic context, causing detrimental harm to the setting of the listed building and failing to preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Yaxley Conservation Area. The harmful effects of this garage are amplified by the fact that it has been built adjacent to an identical but authorised structure, thus blurring the boundary between the historic listed building and its curtilage and the adjacent modern development. As such, the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008, policies En2, En5, En6, En9 and En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policies E1 and E3 of the Huntingdonshire Development Management DPD: Proposed Submission 2010 and policies DM13 and DM27 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 – Development Management Policies, 2012.

(ii) that application No. 12/00453/LBC be refused for the following reasons –

- ◆ the proposed 1st floor extension constitutes an overly large edition to the listed building with an assertive dormer window and unsympathetic building materials (concrete roof tiles and plastic rain water goods) that would dramatically change its scale, form and appearance to the extent that the special historic and architectural interest of the building as a designated heritage asset would be substantially harmed. As such the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, policy

ENV6 of the East of England Plan 2008, policy En2 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy E3 of the Huntingdonshire Development Management DPD: Proposed Submission 2010 and Policy DM27 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 – Development Management Policies, 2012; and

- ◆ the range of proposed external and internal alterations to the fabric of the listed building that are listed on the drawings and described on the submitted heritage statement are insufficiently precise and ambiguous. This precludes an accurate assessment of the effects of the works on this special historic and architectural interest of the building as designated heritage asset. In the absence of a satisfactory schedule of works it is deemed that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposals would not cause significant harm to the special and historic and architectural interest of the building. As such the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, policy ENV6 of the East of England Plan 2008, policy En2 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy E3 of the Huntingdonshire Development Management DPD: Proposed Submission 2010 and policy DM27 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 – Development Management Policies 2012.

**(g) Change of use from commercial to residential to include converting and extending existing building to form annexe to No. 70 High Street, 64 High Street, Earith – 12/01315/FUL**

*(Mr M Hall, agent, addressed the Panel on the application.)*

that the application be refused for the following reason:-

the application is described as including an “annexe” but the proposal does not reasonably constitute “annexe” accommodation to No. 70 High Street by reason of its scale, degree, physical detachment from No. 70 and the existence of all necessary facilities for day to day existence and, in this regard, it has the character of a self-contained dwelling. The bulk, mass and attractive appearance of the proposed extension to the existing building to provide the proposed “annexe” would fail to preserve the character and

appearance of the Earth Conservation Area and would harmfully impinge on the setting of the Grade II Listed Building (Nos. 66/68). For these reasons, the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan 1995, policies En2, En5, En6, En9 and En25 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy CS1 of the Huntingdonshire Core Strategy 2009, policies E1 and E3 of the Huntingdonshire - Development Management Plan DPD: Proposed Submission 2010 and policies DM13 and DM27 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 Development Management Policies, 2012.

(h) **Hard Tennis Court and Associated Embankment/Landscaping, The Cottage, 25 Main Road, Stonely – 12/01111/FUL**

*(Councillor K Hutchinson, Kimbolton & Stonely Parish Council, addressed the Panel on the application.)*

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy to include matters relating to time limit, hard and soft landscaping and to prohibit the installation of floodlighting.

(i) **Erection of an industrial (B1) building, Fen Road Industrial Estate Fen Road, Pidley-cum-Fenton – 12/01266/FUL**

*(See Minute No. 34 for Members' interests.)*

*(Mr D Mead, agent addressed the Panel on the application.)*

that the application be refused for the following reasons -

- ◆ the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of policy SS1 of the East of England Plan – Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2008, policies E8 and En17 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995, policy CS1 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009, policies E8, P2 and P7 of the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010, draft policy 7 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 – draft strategic options and policies, 2012 and policy DM5 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 – Draft Development Management Policies, 2012 in that the proposal relates to non-essential development in the countryside. The proposal would represent a significant expansion and consolidation of development on the edge of the village which would be detrimental to and, have an adverse

impact on, the character and appearance of the site and the locality in general. The proposal would be contrary to the principles of sustainability in that the remote location of the site would result in the majority of journeys to and from the development being made by private car; and

- ◆ the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of policy E10 of the Development Management DPD Proposed Submission 2010 and policy DN6 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 – Draft Development Management Policies, 2012 in that the proposal has not demonstrated that adequate parking, turning, loading and un-loading space, to the standards of the local planning authority, to serve the existing industrial units and the proposed units are available within the curtilage of the site. The lack of appropriate vehicle provision within the curtilage of the site could result in vehicles parking on or reversing onto Fen Road to the detriment of the safety of traffic and pedestrians using this road.

(j) **Erection of a bungalow and associated access, land between 37 and 39 Blenheim Road, Ramsey – 12/00980/OUT**

*(Mr W Allwood, agent, addressed the Panel on the application.)*

that the application be refused for the following reasons:-

- ◆ that the proposal by reason of its location and relationship to the existing frontage dwellings would not be sensitive to the form and character of the existing built environment and would thereby have an adverse impact on the character of the townscape of this part of Ramsey and it would impair views out of the adjacent Ramsey Conservation Area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan – Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2008, policies En5, En9 and H35 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan, 1995, policy HL5 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan Alteration 2002, policy CS1 of the Huntingdonshire Core Strategy 2009, policies E1 and E3 of the Huntingdonshire Development Management DPD: Proposed Submission 2010 and policies DM13 and DM27 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 – Development Management Policies 2012; and
- ◆ the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent residents by reason of increased noise and disturbance that would be caused by vehicles travelling along the access to

the dwelling and manoeuvring close to the boundaries with the neighbouring properties contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, policy H31 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, policy H7 of the Huntingdonshire Development Management DPD: Proposed Submission 2010 and policy EN14 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 – Development Management Policies, 2012.

### **36. APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Planning Service Manager (Development Management) reported on the outcome of eight appeals against refusal of planning permission by the District Council (a copy of his report and a summary of the cases with wider implications for the planning process are appended in the Minute Book).

The Panel's attention was drawn to the circumstances of decisions in Great Gransden and St. Neots in which the Inspector, in dismissing appeals for proposed development, had placed greater weight on the residential amenity of neighbouring householders rather than the development of commercial or economic enterprises.

In relation to an appeal against development at Hemingford Abbots, the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) reminded Members how important it was to justify each term used in every reason given for refusal of an application by referring to the Inspector's comments in respect of the failure by the Council to adequately substantiate a reason for refusal relating to the felling of trees.

Chairman